



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,830	11/09/2001	John Zimmerman	701483 (PHIL06-01483)	3045

24737 7590 07/06/2007

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, FARZANA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,830

Applicant(s)

ZIMMERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Farzana E. Hossain

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/08/02 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to communications filed 11/22/2006. Claims 1, 25, 40 and 41 have been amended. Claims 2-24, 26, 39 and 42 are original.

2. Claim 25 as a minor amendment but is still listed under Original.

3. The applicant made no reference to the following statements from the last office action dated 08/23/2006:

a. The declaration filed on 06-01-06 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Schaefer reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Schaefer reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The declaration fails to provide continuous diligence from March 2, 2001 to November 9, 2001.

b. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Schaefer reference. While conception

is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The declaration fails to provide conception for independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40, specifically selectively generating a notification signal as a function of said detected special event content and a subscriber profile. Therefore, the declaration does not provide conception for the dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-33, 35, 36, 41-42, specifically including claims 2-7, 9, 15-20, 22, 41-42. The lack of conception for the dependent claims include (but is not limited to) a measurable characteristic of a subscriber, mathematical representation of a notification preference and communication of a message, operation of an appliance, and a device operating in active or standby modes.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Schaefer does not teach or suggest the invention, specifically the ability to detect special event content from within a plurality of broadcast content streams based on a content change in at least one of the detectable content

attributes (Pages 14-15). The applicant further argues that the viewer is provided with triggers and the set top box compares the trigger with user profile to determine the information alerts associated with the trigger and therefore cannot sense a content change and the STB can not differentiate information alerts from other contents (Page 15). Applicant also argues that Yen does not remedy the deficiencies in Schaefer (page 16). Applicant makes these arguments with respect to Claims 1, 14, 27 and 40 (Page 15).

In response to the arguments, Schaefer discloses the set top box has the ability to detect special event content within broadcast content streams of different programs (Page 1, paragraph 0015, Pages 4-05, paragraph 0042-0043). Schaefer discloses multiple detectable content attributes or triggers for alert types such as emergency alerts, information alerts, weather alerts (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0047) and a set top box senses a content change in at least one of said detectable content attributes within said plurality of broadcast content streams including the type of alert such as information alert or weather alert and whether there is an alert via a trigger (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0047). Yen discloses that the subscriber profile provides a threshold level of a subscriber profile (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21, Column 11, lines 58-67, Column 12, lines 1-15). Schaefer and Yen meet the limitations as disclosed.

Only Claim 1 was amended with new limitations, the arguments are moot with respect to claims 14, 27, and 40 as they have not been amended or argued with respect to the previous limitations.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 42 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 42 recites, "selectively generated notification signal" instead of --method--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 14-17, 21-30, 34-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaefer et al (US 2002/0124252 and hereafter referred to as "Schaefer").

Regarding Claims 14, 27, and 40, Schaefer discloses an appliance comprising a receiver capable of receiving broadcast content streams (Figures 1-3, 152); and a monitoring system or set top box (STB) capable of identifying special event content

within the received broadcast content streams (Page 5, paragraph 0045), each of the received broadcast streams having detectable content attributes or triggers (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0045), the monitoring system operable to sense a content change within at least of the received streams as a function detectable content attributes (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0045), detect the special event content broadcast within the least of on the received steams as a function sensed content change (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0046) and selectively generate a notification signal a function of detected special event and a subscriber profile (Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0047).

Regarding Claims 15 and 28, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of 14 and 27 respectively. Schaefer discloses that the subscriber profile is stored in memory (Page 7, paragraph 0062, Page 4, paragraph 0038) and comprises at least one record that maintains at least one measurable characteristic of an associated subscriber or specific program, time of day, type of information alerts (Figure 5, Page 5, paragraphs 0046-0047).

Regarding Claims 16 and 29, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 15 and 28 respectively. Schaefer discloses the stored subscriber profile is always compared with the alert in order to display a notification signal (Figure 7, 706). It is necessarily included that a user profile is initially set as a default profile in order to compare alerts to user profile in order to determine if the notification symbol should be generated.

Regarding Claim 17 and 30, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 15 and 28 respectively. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system is further operable to update the stored subscriber profile (Page 5, paragraph 0047-0049).

Regarding Claim 21, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claim 14. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system comprises to comprising a content monitoring controller or processor (Page 5, paragraph 0045) that is operable to receive the plurality of broadcast stream from at least on receiver (Figures 1-3, 152), monitor the plurality of received streams (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0046), sense changes in the plurality of received broadcast content streams as a function of detectable content attributes (Page 5, paragraph 0044-0049).

Regarding Claim 22, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claim 14. Schaefer disclose that the identifying special content within a plurality of broadcast content streams comprising a special event detecting controller or processor (Page 5, paragraph 0045) that identifies special event content as a function of the sensed content change (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0046), the content detecting controller operable to direct at least one of a plurality communication units including STB, cellular telephone, pager (Page 5, paragraphs 0044, 0050) to communicate a message to an associated subscriber (Figure 6).

Regarding Claim 23 and 34, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 21 and 27 respectively. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system is further operable to identify the scheduled broadcast content or regular programming and unscheduled

Art Unit: 2623

broadcast content or emergency alert that preempts scheduled broadcast content by displaying the emergency warning (Page 5, paragraph 0046).

Regarding Claims 24 and 37, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 14 and 27 respectively. Schaefer discloses that a trigger with information alert can appear (Page 7, paragraphs 0067-0070). Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system is further operable to monitor video content (Page 6, paragraphs 0068-0069) within the plurality of broadcast streams.

Regarding Claims 25, and 38, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 24 and 37 respectively. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system detects the special event content broadcast within the at least one of broadcast content stream as a function of video content (Page 7, paragraph 0068-0069) within the plurality of broadcast streams.

Regarding Claims 26 and 39, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 24 and 37 respectively. Schaefer discloses that content attributes filter the triggers in the VBI or text of the video/television signal to transmit information alerts to the viewer (Page 7, paragraphs 0068-0070), which reads on monitoring the transcript of the video content and the monitoring system detects the special event broadcast within the broadcast streams as a function of the transcript.

Regarding Claim 35, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claim 27. Schaefer disclose that the subscriber profile is actively associated (Page 5, paragraphs 0046-0048).

Regarding Claim 36, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claim 27. Schaefer disclose that the subscriber profile is passively associated (Page 5, paragraph 0049).

Regarding Claim 41, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claim 40. Schaefer discloses that the selectively generated notification signal directs operation of an appliance (Figure 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 1-13, 18-20, 31-33, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Yen et al (US 6,668,278 and hereafter referred to as "Yen").

Regarding Claim 1, Schaefer discloses a monitoring system capable of identifying special event content within a plurality of broadcast content streams (Figures 1-3, 152), each of said plurality of broadcast content streams having multiple detectable content attributes multiple detectable content attributes or triggers for alert types such as emergency alerts, information alerts, weather alerts (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0047), said monitoring system operable to

(i) receive the plurality of broadcast content streams or broadcasts of different programs or channels such as a movie on one channel, a sporting event on another channel (Page 1, paragraph 0015, Pages 4-05, paragraph 0042-0043),

(ii) monitor the plurality of broadcast content streams (Page, 5, paragraphs 0044-0047, Page 7, paragraph 0068)

(iii) sense a content change in at least one of said detectable content attributes within said plurality of broadcast content streams including the type of alert and whether there is an alert via a trigger (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0047)

(iv) detect a characteristic in said sensed content change that matches a criteria indicative of said special event content or detect the trigger has content information the matches the profile of the user (Page 5, paragraph 0046-0047); and

(v) selectively generate a notification signal based on said indication of said special event content and a subscriber profile (Page 5, paragraphs 0043-0047).

Schaefer is silent on a threshold level.

In analogous art, Yen discloses that the subscriber profile provides a threshold level of a subscriber profile (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21, Column 11, lines 58-67, Column 12, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaefer to include that the subscriber profile provides a mathematical representation of a notification preference of an associated subscriber (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21, Column 11, lines 58-67, Column 12, lines 1-15) as taught by Yen in order to present

information to a recipient from filtering information based on the behavior of the recipient (Column 1, lines 63-67, Column 2, lines 1-4, lines 42-52) as disclosed by Yen.

Regarding Claim 2, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Schaefer discloses that the subscriber profile is stored in memory (Page 7, paragraph 0062, Page 4, paragraph 0038) and comprises at least one record that maintains at least one measurable characteristic of an associated subscriber or specific program, time of day, type of information alerts (Figure 5, Page 5, paragraphs 0046-0047).

Regarding Claim 3, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 2. Schaefer discloses the stored subscriber profile is always compared with the alert in order to display a notification signal (Figure 7, 706). It is necessarily included that a user profile is initially set as a default profile in order to compare alerts to user profile in order to determine if the notification symbol should be generated.

Regarding Claim 4, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 2. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system is further operable to update the stored subscriber profile (Page 5, paragraph 0047-0049).

Regarding Claim 5, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 2. Yen discloses that the subscriber profile provides a mathematical representation of a notification preference of an associated subscriber (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21, Column 11, lines 58-67, Column 12, lines 1-15).

Regarding Claim 6, 19, and 32, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claims 5, 18, and 31 respectively. Schaefer is silent on the mathematical representation. Yen discloses that the subscriber profile is generated by the monitoring

the system at definition and includes a default notification preference that is modifiable by the associated subscriber or a value can be assigned in response to an absence of detectable content or tag, which is in this case is a default value that the recipient can change (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21).

Regarding Claim 7, 20, and 33, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claims 5, 18, and 33 respectively. Schaeffer is silent on the mathematical representation. Yen discloses that the as a function of the mathematical representation, the notification signal selectively directing the plurality of the set top box to communicate a message to the associated subscriber (Column 11, lines 12-19).

Regarding Claim 8, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system comprises to comprising a content monitoring controller or processor (Page 5, paragraph 0045) that is operable to receive the plurality of broadcast stream from at least on receiver (Figures 1-3, 152), monitor the plurality of received streams (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0046), sense changes in the plurality of received broadcast content streams as a function of detectable content attributes (Page 5, paragraph 0044-0049).

Regarding Claim 9, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Schaefer disclose that the identifying special content within a plurality of broadcast content streams comprising a special event detecting controller or processor (Page 5, paragraph 0045) that identifies special event content as a function of the sensed content change (Page 5, paragraphs 0044-0046), the content detecting controller operable to direct at least one of a plurality communication units including STB, cellular

telephone, pager (Page 5, paragraphs 0044, 0050) to communicate a message to an associated subscriber (Figure 6).

Regarding Claim 10, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 9. Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system is further operable to identify the scheduled broadcast content or regular programming and unscheduled broadcast content or emergency alert that preempts scheduled broadcast content by displaying the emergency warning (Page 5, paragraph 0046).

Regarding Claim 11, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Schaeffer discloses that a trigger with information alert can appear (Page 7, paragraphs 0067-0070). Schaefer discloses that the monitoring system is further operable to monitor video content (Page 6, paragraphs 0068-0069) within the plurality of broadcast streams.

Regarding Claim 12, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 11. Schaeffer discloses that the monitoring system detects the special event content broadcast within the at least one of broadcast content stream as a function of video content (Page 7, paragraph 0068-0069) within the plurality of broadcast streams.

Regarding Claim 13, Schaefer and Yen disclose all the limitations of Claim 11. Schaeffer discloses that content attributes filter the triggers in the VBI or text of the video/television signal to transmit information alerts to the viewer (Page 7, paragraphs 0068-0070), which reads on monitoring the transcript of the video content and the monitoring system detects the special event broadcast within the broadcast streams as a function of the transcript.

Regarding Claims 18 and 31, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claims 15 and 28 respectively. Schaeffer is silent on the mathematical representation. Yen discloses that the subscriber profile provides a mathematical representation of a notification preference of an associated subscriber (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21, Column 11, lines 58-67, Column 12, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaefer to include that the subscriber profile provides a mathematical representation of a notification preference of an associated subscriber (Column 9, lines 53-67, Column 10, lines 16-21, Column 11, lines 58-67, Column 12, lines 1-15) as taught by Yen in order to present information to a recipient from filtering information based on the behavior of the recipient (Column 1, lines 63-67, Column 2, lines 1-4, lines 42-52) as disclosed by Yen.

Regarding Claim 42, Schaefer discloses all the limitations of Claim 41. Schaefer is silent on the active and standby mode. Yen discloses that the appliance is capable of operation in an active mode and a standby mode and when the appliance is operating in the standby mode, the signal directs the associated appliance to switch from the standby mode to the active mode (Column 13, lines 38-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaefer to include the operation in an active mode and a standby mode and when the appliance is operating in the standby mode, the signal directs the associated appliance to switch from the standby mode to the active mode (Column 13, lines 38-58)

as taught by Yen in order to present information to a recipient from filtering information based on the behavior of the recipient regardless of activity of the machine (Column 2, lines 61-67, Column 3, lines 1-7) as disclosed by Yen.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2623

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FEH
June 27, 2007


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600